

11-15-2018

University of Northern Iowa Elementary Teacher Education Senate Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Elementary Teacher Education Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2018 Elementary Teacher Education Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/te_esdocuments



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Elementary Teacher Education Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Elementary Teacher Education Senate Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2018" (2018). *Documents - Elementary Senate*. 22.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/te_esdocuments/22

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Elementary Teacher Education Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Elementary Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Elementary Teacher Education Senate Meeting
3:30-5:00 Thursday, November 15, 2018
SEC 304
Minutes

Present:

Betsy Zan (Early Childhood Education), Carolyn Weber (Middle Level Education), Rick Knivsland (Art Education), Sarah Vander Zanden (Literacy Education), Chepina Rumsey (Math Education - ALT), Greg Bourassa (Professional Sequence), Louren Kilburg (Undergraduate Student), Cathy Miller (Ed Prep Faculty Chair), Chad Christopher (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Allison Barness (Clinical Experience)

Absent:

Kim Hurley (Physical/Health Education), Chris Kliewer (Special Education), Merrilee Betts (Teacher Practitioner), JD Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education), Music Education

Guests:

Angie Cox (Rod Library), Mary Donegan-Ritter (Curriculum & Instruction)

I. Welcome

II. Approval of September 20, 2018 Senate Meeting Minutes (Electronic)
Minutes approved with revision.

III. Old Business

1. State Approval Update

Our EPP program was formally approved. Chad Christopher shared that there were no concerns about our Educator Preparation program, but the State Board of Education wanted to be sure that our program prepares teachers to work with diversity and to increase diversity in faculty and student populations. This is due to the changing demographics in Iowa. The State Board also wanted to be sure that our candidates are prepared for mental health concerns of children/trauma informed care. Sarah VZ asked what this means. She wondered how we document this, where would it be done, etc. She indicated that this is important, but what would it look like? Chad replied that he thought the State Board wants us to be thinking about doing this. Denise T notes that Iowa rates 51st out of 51 (below Puerto Rico) for supporting mental health of children.

Now that we have been approved we can turn towards our next approval date-- 2024.

IV. New Business

1. General Education Committee Update

Mary Donegan-Ritter shared that the existing Gen. Ed. program has not been updated for many years. It is very large and needs to change. The Higher Learning Commission calls for an outcomes-based Gen. Ed. program that makes sense and

is relevant for today's students. Currently work is being done on outcomes and the committee hopes to figure out how to meet outcomes (structure of Gen. Ed. program) when work continues in spring 2019. Angie Cox reminded us that the University Faculty Senate approved the work and the process being used. Betsy Z. asked for examples of what is meant by outcomes. Mary DR shared that things like communication, writing effectively, etc. are outcomes. Betsy Z followed up with "what about content? The Elem Ed. program relies on Gen. Ed. content. Mary DR called for College of Education faculty to "tune into" the work as it progresses to make sure the Gen. Ed. courses can continue meeting content requirements in the Elementary Ed. program that are needed. Angie C added that the committee wants the Gen. Ed. program to not be something to check off, but something that is a "springboard" to major requirements.

Sarah VZ asked what the credit hour goal is. Mary DR said it will move from 45 (now) to 36 credit hours, cutting about a semester of work. Greg B. asked about what implications are for assessment that are measuring the outcomes. Mary DR said this will not change what is done with major coursework, but will be a focus of developing the course to have outcomes to measure. Greg B. followed up with a question, "Who says we need to do this?" Right now, it is the Provost, from needs of the upcoming HLC process. Greg worries that academic freedom might be impinged upon. We all do things because we are supposed to, but if we have all the courses with the same outcomes, do faculty have a right to not do this? Mary DR noted that this is a real dilemma. Denise T. asked if something has been done to update the LAC recently; she recalls something was done. Angie C. says it was about 10 years ago that revision happened. One aspect of this work was Cornerstone, which grew out of feedback from our last HLC visit. Other attempts to revise the LAC did not change things much. Louren K. asked if students have provided input to the process? Mary DR says yes, there is a student voice to this work. Angie C. says the student reps are developing a mechanism to use to get feedback from students regarding this work. She also noted that this is the first year of a three year timeline to do this work. How this will effect community college transfer students is not yet known.

Cathy M. says that the Elementary TE Senate might put an item on the agenda for the spring to formalize a process to stay informed about the work. Seems Mary DR is the only member of the Gen. Ed. committee from the Elem Ed. program.

2. Reinventing the Professional Sequence Update

The EPP task force has been developed to look at the process for revising the EPP program. JD and Chad will convene the task force tomorrow, review the charge and clarify the task. Chad's question is what the role he and JD will play in this process and what their role on the committee should be. Sarah VD asked if there is a member of this committee who also works on the Gen. Ed. revision program. Chad said no, but that the Gen. Ed. process could be used as a process for the EPP

work and that he and JD will ask about this, if needed, to inform the EPP revision work.

Betsy suggests that someone from the old TESI group be involved with the upcoming work either as consultants to this committee or members of the committee that does the work.

3. Ed Prep Governance Models Update

Cathy M. shared that the governance committee has met several times to make sense of the data collected at the EPP Fall Faculty meeting and from other presentations made by members of the committee.

4. Methods Course Questions--Sarah Vander Zanden

Chad shared what the Secondary Senate discussed about the methods courses having caps. Sarah VD says her department formed a task force of three to look into C & I's methods courses and challenges. She will share what they find with this senate. Sarah VD asked what should be next? Cathy M. replied that Sarah might bring the work done by C & I's task force to the senate. If it resonated with others, then a committee of the Elementary Senate, maybe both senates, could be formed to see if Educator Preparation Program policy can be changed to support class size in methods courses. This committee could look at historical data to see if what they are being told now is correct, and maybe average class size is not the best way to evaluate the work of methods courses. Betsy Z. also asked for "a list of criteria about what makes a methods class a methods class," and how these courses have evolved over time. Denise T. noted that she has a course with "methods" in the title, but it is not a methods course. Allison B. asked if the task force was created due to external calls for it? Sarah VD said "No, it wasn't." She just supported it from a faculty perspective. Carolyn W. asked if the state has a definition of "methods course?" Cathy M. shared that the fire marshall has redefined how many we can fit in some rooms in Wright Hall. This means that we will have to cut the size of courses, elementary methods and math reasoning courses will turn away students starting in fall 2019.

Sarah VD asked what else came up in secondary? Chad shared that if 30 students need methods, 30 get it in one section. Since there is usually one person to teach the course, it is not shared by others. Also, level 3 field experiences are very challenging. Other secondary concerns were names of some courses, is a teaching trumpet course a methods course, for example?

5. TE Diversity Subcommittee

- Diversity Definition

Greg. B asked why this is being done. If it is done to show that we at UNI value diversity, it is problematic. According to Greg B. he says it is a statement that does not show our commitment or work with diversity.

Allison B. concurs. Greg B. continued to say if he has a student who self-identifies as a Nazi, he does not want to send this student out to teach and

does not want to be required to include this student due to the diversity definition. Betsy Z. says if the definition is linked to policy, does it open doors to attract Nazis? Chad says that one way this will be used is to define and find diverse field experience placements, which is needed for the TE clinical sub-committee. Our current definition does not help that. Betsy asks about what our definition means for this purpose – political affiliation, veteran status, for example? Allison B. asks what other universities do, can we find an example? Chad shared that the definition is based on state, peer institution and AACTE work. Chad wonders if we need separate definitions for various purposes/context? Cathy M. wondered if adding context to this, for the purpose of field experience placements would be useful. Cathy M. also reminded us that the EPP mission/vision has a very nice diversity/social justice vibe.

6. Data to Review

- Novice Teacher/Supervisor Survey Data
JD asked for senators to look at the data and see what conclusions they see in the data. Then, at senate meetings we can share what each noticed to discuss. Senators are asked to look at these data before the next senate meeting.
- Praxis Core vs. Praxis II Data
Betsy asked for clarification, Praxis Core is needed for admission to TE program, the other for the license/endorsement. JD spent time reviewing this data, especially the elementary education side. Betsy Z. noted that names were included here, which troubled some. We were reminded not to share the data with others and if we were to share the data program-wide, names would need to be removed.

V. Other

Denise T asked about the work with the Professional Education Sequence becoming Educator Preparation Program revision. This was agreed on at the Joint Senate meeting last month.

VI. Important Dates

1. Next meetings

- Secondary Senate--December 6
- Elementary Senate--December 13